DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 080 726 VT 021 053

TITLE	What Is Career Education? A Conversation with Sidney P. Marland, Jr. and James D. Koerner.
INSTITUTION	Council for Basic Education, Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	Occas-Pap-20
PUB DATE	Feb 73
NOTE	39p.; Proceedings of a conversation between Drs. Marland and Koerner and the Board of Directors and Staff of the Council for Basic Education (October 27, 1972)
AVAILABLE FROM	Council for Basic Education, 725 Fifteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005 (Number 20, $.50, $.40 in quantity)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Career Education; *Divergent Thinking; Educational Change; *Educational Objectives; General Education; *Productive Living; *Relevance (Education); Vocational Education

ABSTRACT

On October 27, 1972 Dr. Sidney P. Marland, Jr., Assistant Secretary for Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Dr. James D. Koerner, Program Officer, Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, joined with the Board of Directors and the staff of the Council for Basic Education in a conversation about career education. The proceedings were recorded and this paper contains most of the remarks made on that occasion. Dr. Marland first framed the topic of career education, stating that it is still a concept, not a blueprint, but an all-inclusive concept ranging from the elementary grades through postsecondary education with particular meaning for the world of adult education. Dr. Koerner then commented on Dr. Marland's remarks, expressing his concern with both the term and the concept of career education and emphasizing that basic education is the real need along with some old-fashined vocational education. Others at the meeting engaged in dialog with the two speakers, arriving at no specific conclusions but perhaps a better understanding of Dr. Marland's concept of career education. (MF)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 080726

What Is Career Education?

A conversation with

SIDNEY P. MARLAND, JR.
Assistant Secretary for Education
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

and

JAMES D. KOERNER
Program Officer
Alfred P. Sloan Foundation

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

UT 021 053

OCCASIONAL PAPERS
NUMBER TWENTY

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

A FEW HIGHLIGHTS FROM THIS PAPER

There is a self-evident need, in my judgment, radically to reform an education which has become non-utilitarian and, in the words of the young people, "irrelevant" to such a large part of our clientele. (Marland, page 5)

Something must change if we are not to have 2½ million children a year drop out of school, drop out of college, leave school with no resources with which to contribute to our society. Something must change to make schools more meaningful for these people and to overcome some of these dreadfully grave deficits in what education might be as distinct from what it is. (Marland, page 7)

. . . We are trying to get Career Education into the system in the early grades—so that a youngster doesn't have to wait until he suddenly arouses himself to the realities of his deficiencies at age 18 or 20. We are attempting to establish Career Education as a way of thinking in addition to, as a supporting instrument for, formal learning in the elementary schools. (Marland, page 26)

What a commentary it would be on universal education if after a century and more of experience with public schooling, on the scale that we have attempted it, the nation were to accept the proposition that the greatest aim of its schools, their highest goal and ultimate purpose, was not to lead people toward a worthy and examined life, not to provide them with some grasp of the long cultural, esthetic, and intellectual tradition of which they are a part—but that the highest goal is just to get people into jobs and to condition them to a life in the marketplace. (Koerner, page 11)

I have the greatest difficulty imagining just how it is that Career Education is going to be taught in the classroom, and what is to be the substance of the curriculum. No one has revealed, for instance, how teachers, who are widely believed to be inadequately trained in the subjects they teach now, are going to be adequately trained in a whole host of new subjects having to do with the labor market (they themselves are almost as far removed from the labor market as their students are). (Koerner, page 14)

Printed February 1973

ED 080726

What Is Career Education?

A conversation with

SIDNEY P. MARLAND, JR.
Assistant Secretary for Education
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

and

JAMES D. KOERNER
Program Officer
Alfred P. Sloan Foundation

On Friday evening, October 27, 1972, Dr. Marland and Dr. Koerner joined with the Board of Directors and the staff of the Council for Basic Education in a conversation about Career Education. The proceedings were recorded and this paper contains most of the remarks made on that occasion.

Dr. Carl Dolce (President of the Board of Directors of the Council for Basic Education): The topic for the evening is Career Education, a very timely and important topic, one which is being widely discussed not only among school people but also by the general public. We have with us this evening two conversationalists who will join with the members of our Board and staff in discussing this very important topic.

Our first conversationalist, Sidney P. Marland, is really the "father" of the Career Education movement, who is certainly most qualified to discuss this particular topic with us. Dr. Marland has been superintendent of schools in Darien, Connecticut; Winnetka, Illinois; and Pittsburgh; served as President of the Institute for Educational Development; has been U.S. Commissioner of Education, and recently has been confirmed, I am pleased to say, as Assistant Secretary for Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Our second conversationalist is James D. Koerner, who is no stranger to many members of our Board. Dr. Koerner is a former

college teacher, served as Executive Director of the Council for Basic Education in the years 1958 and 1959, was editor-in-chief of Educational Development Center, and is presently a program officer of the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation. Dr. Koerner is the author of *The Miseducation of American Teachers, Reform in Education: England and the United States,* and *Who Controls American Education?* He is also the editor of the publication, *The Case for Basic Education,* a book sponsored by the Council for Basic Education.

Our format this evening will be to ask Commissioner Marland to give us some remarks in order to frame the topic of Career Education, then ask Dr. Koerner for his comments, and then invite comments from the Board and staff. I am pleased to present Commissioner Marland.

Dr. Sidney P. Marland

First let me say that I welcome this "conversation" because it is on a topic about which I am deeply concerned. However, I think Carl Dolce errs in bestowing upon me the title "father" of the Career Education idea. The idea of Career Education, however you define it—and it can be defined many ways—and whoever may have launched it, could very easily go back to the 12th century Hebrew scholar Maimonides, who said that we should help our fellow man "by teaching him a trade, or by putting him in the way of business, so that he may earn an honest livelihood, and not be forced to the dreadful alternative of holding out his hand for charity."

So, as for fatherhood, Carl, I'll claim no credit. As to an advocacy role, yes, I will claim that, or at least acknowledge it. And I would say that your esteemed Executive Director, Mortimer Smith, in a splendid interchange that we had in Pittsburgh some years ago, when I was superintendent there, asserted that I was indeed fulfilling, as superintendent of schools in a big city, some of the hopes and goals and aspirations of this organization. He wrote an essay attributing to me some of the things we were doing to support basic education.

I think we should say at the start that when we talk about Career Education we are not talking about a zero-sum game which somebody wins and somebody loses. We are talking about enhancing the lives of people, whereas basic education has to be fundamental. As a school teacher, I have to hold that that balance is basic, and I am trying to make it work better.

This is a good opportunity, I feel, to share with those of you who are concerned with basic education some of the notions we have put

forward that we hope will enhance basic education as well as other things in the United States through Career Education. I recognize that there is some uncertainty about these ideas within the Council for Basic Education. This is true as well in other parts of the education world. As Commissioner of Education, I have some uncertainties about these ideas myself, because they are very large and very sweeping, and, like any large and sweeping thing, they may well be right or they may well be wrong. This discussion and conversation, therefore, I can assure you, are valued by me.

The CBE Statement of Purpose affirms the necessity for all students to receive adequate instruction in the basic intellectual disciplines: English, mathematics, science, history, and foreign languages. I have, as Mortimer knows, fought for, and long held to the rightness of, these principles of basic education. I guess I am trying to reach an abstraction that goes beyond them, for the things you speak of in basic education are essential not only to Career Education but to free society itself. You speak of English, science, mathematics, history, and foreign languages. I would add music and art and drama and something that would speak to the social sciences other than history. Nonetheless, we are in broad agreement as to where learning begins and what it should accomplish.

The CBE Statement of Purpose also speaks of the need for good vocational training "in due subordination to the school's fundamental purpose of intellectual discipline." Here perhaps we might disagree a little bit, we might shadow our meanings a little bit, because we may quarrel here and there over the definitions of discipline and of the subordination of the school's fundamental purpose of intellectual discipline. I guess I would hold that intellectual discipline should obtain in all of man's endeavors. I happen to be a teacher of English. I have earned my living by using English not only in the classroom but during the some twenty-five years since I left the classroom. To me, English has been not only an intellectual discipline but my Career Education. At the same time, if I were going to ride in an airplane that had been serviced by a mechanic with an intellectually sloppy approach to what he was doing, I would be very uneasy. Intellectual discipline is not confined to the things that we describe as the liberal arts.

I would also point out that vocational training, as it has been perceived since 1917 under the Smith-Hughes Act, is sometimes a component, and a very useful and interesting and relevant component,

of Career Education, but far from the whole of it. Perhaps before our conversation is over I may help you to perceive ways in which Career Education is quite different from vocational education. Educational theorists have long recognized the need to integrate the intellectual and the utilitarian aspects of learning, ending the foolishly divisive practice of separating the academic and the occupational and calling the latter an inferior sort of endeavor for inferior minds. We have long been aware of the relegation of the not-so-lively learner to that vocational school down the street. This attitude has done untold mischief, in my judgment, in mindlessly disparaging the personal and fully human fulfilling ways of living, the rewarding kinds of work that all people should have the option to enjoy without social stigma.

Alfred North Whitehead wrote in 1929:

> The antithesis between a technical and a liberal education is fallacious. There can be no adequate technical education which is not liberal, and no liberal education which is not technical: that is, no education which does not impart both technical and intellectual vision. In simpler language, education should turn out the pupil with something he knows well and something he can do well.

About ten years ago one of the distinguished deans in the undergraduate school at Harvard said: "Here in Cambridge we have the finest undergraduate liberal arts program in the United States. You probably think I am speaking of Harvard, but I am speaking of MIT." Now here is the universality of learning that speaks both to the utilitarian aspects and to the intellectual aspects and claims that they are one and the same. Very few people, I think, would challenge the assertion that MIT is concerned with people who are developing their careers in a Career Education mode, yet here—ten years ago—a Harvard dean claimed that MIT possessed the superior liberal arts program.

James Conant, writing in *Slums and Suburbs* in 1961, said this:

> I must record an educational heresy, or rather support a proposition that many will accept as self-evident but that some professors of the liberal arts will denounce as dangerously heretical. I submit that in a heavily urbanized and industrialized free society the educational experiences of youth should fit their subsequent employment. There should be a smooth transition from full-time schooling to a full-time job, whether that transition be after grade 10 or after graduation from high school, college, or university.

If Whitehead's and Conant's positions made sense in 1929 and 1961, how much more appropriate they are today. Their remarks also make clear that I am not the father of the Career Education idea.

Youth unemployment is a terribly embarrassing condition in our society at this time. Approximately 11 per cent of our young people between the ages of 18 and 25 are unemployed, and not all of them because they're dropouts from secondary or postsecondary education. *Business Week* reported recently that the job gap for college graduates in the '70s is gravely serious. While short of such skilled and semi-skilled workers as auto mechanics, appliance repairmen, paramedical workers, and secretaries, we have a glut of those seeking entry into what are called the higher callings. One of every four young chemists in the United States at this moment is out of work. Law schools graduated 10,000 more men and women last year than could be used in legal work. More than 200,000 teachers were graduated this past June, and more than 111,000 of them are still wondering where they will find work. Our information and guidance system served these people poorly.

There is a self-evident need, in my judgment, radically to reform an education which has become non-utilitarian and, in the words of the young people, "irrelevant" to such a large part of our clientele. Fully a third of our high school students leave school before graduation, with no skills, no marketable resources, and no intention or competence to enter college. Two and a half million people a year are leaving institutions of learning by dropout or by opt-out or by having finished high school with a general curriculum background, which I hold is nothing in terms of today's expectations. Two and a half million each year—roughly 850,000 dropouts from high school, 800,000 who graduate from the general curriculum, and 850,000 who leave college neither schooled nor skilled.

A week or ten days ago, *The New York Times* carried an editorial about the Fleischmann Commission's report on the quality, cost, and financing of elementary and secondary education in New York State that relates to this subject. It said the commission did not have to look far or hard to identify the schools' most conspicuous failure: "That failure is personified by a hopeless army of youths who leave school, either at graduation or before, with insufficient mastery of either the basic or vocational skills needed for decent jobs and meaningful careers."

We have tended to respond to the increasing sophistication of work and steadily reduced employment opportunities for the unskilled by

extending the period of adolescence to what I feel are becoming unconscionable limits and by extending, as James Coleman recently noted, "the 'baby-sitting' function of the school." He continued as follows:

> This transformation of the schools in response to society has had a consequence that is important in considering the path to becoming adult. This is the massive enlargement of the *student* role of young persons to fill the vacuum that the changes in the family and work place created. The student role of young persons has become enlarged to the point where that role constitutes the major portion of their youth. But the student role is not a role of taking action and experiencing consequences. It is not a role by which one learns by hard knocks. It is a relatively passive role, always in preparation for action, but never acting . . . The consequence of the expansion of the student role, and the action-poverty it implies for the young, has been an increased restiveness among the young. They are shielded from responsibility, and they become irresponsible; they are held in a dependent status, and they come to act as dependents; they are kept away from productive work, and they become unproductive . . .

I hold very closely with Coleman on this. I disagree with him on some things, in a very friendly way, but the action-poverty of the young which he describes here (and by which, the context makes clear, he means *lack of action* rather than poverty-induced *action*) is something on which I feel a very close accord with him. I count him as a giant among us as he thinks about schooling. He thinks very deeply and cares very much about schooling, and when he speaks of action-poverty among the young I pray that as a practitioner I can find something to do about it.

We are not ready at this time to give a sharp definition of what we call Career Education. I have mine. Others in the Office of Education and people around the United States have theirs. I hold that, if this is a worthy idea, what influence I can bring to bear upon it should be that of releasing the creativity of other people as *they* hammer out definitions. I can provide some broad parameters of what I think I mean, but if it's a good idea, if it has meaning for bringing importance to education in the United States, if it has meaning for those students who need the motivation that I feel is implicit in Career Education in order to learn well, then I say that the worst possible thing would be a Federal blueprint that says this is what you must do to comply with the Career Education notion.

We are laying some generalizations before the United States—not only its educators but business and labor, universities, parents, young people themselves—and saying here is what it may be, and here is where we will try to help you work this out—if *you* want it. But the worst possible way to bring about a major reform in education, so that education begins to work for all our people, so we don't have 18 million illiterates in this country, as we now have, would be to provide a Federal blueprint.

Something must change if we are not to have 2½ million children a year drop out of school, drop out of college, leave school with no resources with which to contribute to our society. Something must change to make schools more meaningful for these people and to overcome some of these dreadfully grave deficits in what education might be as distinct from what it is.

Career Education is still a concept, not a program, not a blueprint, not a set of do-this-and-do-that. As a concept it is all-inclusive, ranging from very early elementary grades through secondary and post-secondary education, certainly through professional school, where it is most germane and where people truly seem to know what they want to do and are doing it. In the world of adult education it has particular meaning, for, whatever the Career Education idea is, certainly it is hospitable to the middle-aged or maturing person who faces a world that is changing perhaps more swiftly than he. The resources of education would respond to that person's needs when he wanted it to, facilitating his entry into, say, the Columbia School of Social Work at the age of 58.

I talked to President McGill of Columbia two or three days ago. I asked him: Would a man or woman at age 58 be welcome in your School of Social Work, would he find his place readily and move into the stream of growth, continuity, and fulfillment if he decided to change his career? McGill had to say the answer was No, but he went on to say that he regretted it.

Career Education in the elementary school would be mostly directed toward generating awareness in a student of his eventual need for a career, of what careers are all about, of what work is all about, of what the economic world is like. The elementary-age child no longer has an opportunity to perceive these things at home, on the whole. He can't help his father drive that mule, or the tractor, very often. He can't work in his father's store as I did, very often. He can't learn the reality of work through the eyes of an adult whom he loves, and

who loves him, and begin to perceive what work is about. I would hold that much of the uneasiness and restlessness and, indeed, the dropping out of our young people from the conventions of education today may be because they have not had an opportunity to perceive what our economic world is about and what work is like. They have not had an opportunity to view it closely, because our society is moving so swiftly.

In high school the career aspect of the curriculum would be intensified and sharpened, enabling the young person not only to arrive intelligently at a number of career possibilities he would like to explore but to get some hands-on feeling for them, certainly never closing out other choices. At this age he would rarely say I'm going to be this, or this, or this. Having a wide range of career information on which to draw, he would at some point be prepared to leave the system without being a dropout, ready to go to work, maybe at age 16 as a hospital orderly, well equipped to be that if that's what he wants to be at age 16 with an I.Q. of 75, or maybe at age 30 as a surgeon if that's what he wants.

Career Education is a way to prepare all people, equip all people for what they want to do in the world. I myself am especially concerned with young people. I would hope that they not have to live in Coleman's student sanctuary but can begin to get a feeling for work as part of education. I have spent most of my life working at reinforcing academic learning as a teacher and an administrator, and I am convinced that Career Education, when all is said and done, is a way to reinforce that kind of learning. It is a way of making history, algebra, English, and French come to life in ways that are important to young people because they have been informed about what they want to do with their life. For the first time, as Career Education becomes a reality, as I am convinced it will, many of our young people will sense a control over their own destiny. They will have learned that these are the career choices open to them and that these will be the manpower needs of our society as it is moving.

I am not saying that these "needs" will be stated as anything so specific as bricklayer or computer programmer or cosmetologist or surgeon. Specific needs may change. But some 23,000 different jobs now prevailing in the United States have been reduced to fifteen "clusters," and a young person now can begin to learn about work in, say, the health cluster over the whole range—from hospital orderly to surgeon. He can learn something about this cluster and begin to

make his choices at the same time he begins to learn how to write and to learn English, history, and science. He is motivated, controlling his destiny, believing that something out there is important, is valued, because that is the way our society works. He is not expected to learn algebra or history because the guidance counselor says he should learn algebra, or because the curriculum says that if he is going to college history is important, but because he begins to perceive the relationship between the world of learning and the world of work.

Dr. James D. Koerner

I am reassured to realize that Dr. Marland has some of the same trouble with the term "Career Education" that I do. The first task that confronts anyone who proposes to talk about this elusive subject is to find out what it is. If you approach the subject without a special knowledge of it, as was the case with me when Mortimer Smith asked me to share this platform with Dr. Marland, you have some homework to do. In spite of the frequency with which the term Career Education appears in the press, particularly the educational press, the meaning of it remains very obscure. One doesn't know whether it represents a serious national movement in American education, or whether it is merely a kind of secular cult with a scattering of rather vocal disciples around the country. In many ways it resembles a bandwagon of the sort that come and go in American education with more or less predictable regularity, a little like celestial comets. In many ways it appears to be more permanent than that.

But even after you have done your homework you may find that you have failed to penetrate the conceptual and terminological fog that surrounds the subject. If Career Education means one thing to Dr. Marland, it means a hundred other things to a hundred other people, a hundred other spokesmen for Career Education, who themselves seem unwilling or unable to reduce the obscurity that surrounds the subject. So even as I make bold here tonight to talk about Career Education, I have a strong feeling that I am going to spend a part of my time, as one of my colleagues puts it in another context, "shoveling smoke."

One might ask why educators have given such instant acclaim to so nebulous an idea as Career Education. I don't know, except that they may merely be following custom. Our educational history is replete with ideas and slogans that seem to generate enthusiasm in more or less direct proportion to their imprecision. One thinks of Progressive Education immediately as an example, Life-Adjustment

Education, another example. Consumer Education, another example, Education for Creative Leisure, still another. And the immediate predecessor to Career Education, of course, has been Quality Education—a fuzzy double noun that has filled the political and educational air like a chant for the last few years, but that still awaits a careful and clear definition.

An irreverent observer who also is informed by experience might suggest that the support of educators for all of these dimly perceived ideas may have less to do with commitment than currency. A hundred million dollars or a couple of hundred million Federal dollars is a powerful proselytizer. It represents a pot of money big enough to produce instant converts to almost anything. I don't suggest that Career Education is without its true believers, but I can't help wondering just how many there would be and just how compelling the whole idea of Career Education would prove to be if it had to make its way in the schools solely on its merits.

Because of the difficulty of discussing an idea as hard to pin down as Career Education is, the only thing I have been able to do has been to try to arrive at what I might call a consensus position, by reviewing a number of writings and other documents on the subject. I don't ascribe this consensus position to Dr. Marland, necessarily, but I think that we have to have a definition in order to have something to discuss. Much of it does come out of the Office of Education, however, even though it may not represent Dr. Marland's own position.

So I take the following definition or description of Career Education as, if not *the* official one, at least *an* official one. It comes from an Office of Education document called a "briefing paper" published recently, and I quote: "The fundamental concept of career education is that all educational experiences, curriculum, instruction, and counseling, should begin the preparation for economic independence and an appreciation of the dignity of work." Similar global definitions abound in the writings and speeches of leading advocates of Career Education. Here are a few of them by different people: "Career Education is a total concept that should permeate all education." Another one: "All education must be reformulated around Career choices." Still another one: "All educational experiences should be geared to the world of work."

If we are to take definitions like that at face value, it seems to me that no one of CBE persuasion could accept such a blinkered descrip-

tion of the purpose of education, a definition that is so uncompromisingly economic, so unabashedly narrow in conception, so relentlessly tied to the gross national product, and so anti-intellectual. What a commentary it would be on universal education if after a century and more of experience with public schooling, on the scale that we have attempted it, the nation were to accept the proposition that the greatest aim of its schools, their highest goal and ultimate purpose, was not to lead people toward a worthy and examined life, not to provide them with some grasp of the long cultural, esthetic, and intellectual tradition of which they are a part—but that the highest goal is just to get people into jobs and to condition them to a life in the marketplace. So my first problem with the idea of Career Education—and again I have to add that I'm not ascribing this particular definition to Dr. Marland, but I think it is the Office of Education's position—my first problem with it is what I can only call the meanness of its vision.

I have a second problem with Career Education, closely associated with the first. It has to do with the absoluteness, the totality, with which the idea of Career Education is put forth most often by its advocates. Now the idea evidently, although I am not sure, had its origins in the dissatisfaction that I think everybody—educators, laymen, CBE, politicians, parents—feels, and that Dr. Marland has rightly cited, with the fact that tens of thousands of young people continue to emerge from the schools uneducated, untrained, and, if not unemployable, at least unemployed. That fact is incontestable and deplorable. But from that fact Career Education seems to have grown by what it fed on, and it now encompasses all students everywhere in all schools at all levels of the educational system. I don't know how this quantum jump was made exactly, but it was made and there now appears to be no possible escape from Career Education for anybody, anywhere.

As propounded by the Office of Education, Career Education contemplates nothing less than a revolution. It is not clear, of course, at this point how the schools are going to respond to this proposition from the Office of Education, but if the schools take it seriously it will mean, it seems to me clear, that every textbook has to be revised, that every syllabus and every curriculum guide has to be not only revised but conceived anew, every teacher and every administrator retrained, every activity of every school replanned—all of this with what is called the "world of work" uppermost in mind. It is this

compulsory and all-embracing character of Career Education which, together with its limited view of educational purpose, seems to me to most invite opposition.

Now I suppose we can be grateful in a wry sort of way that the Office of Education has moved so far beyond its previous position, so far beyond the days when it promulgated the idea of Life-Adjustment Education so successfully. You may remember that the central thesis of Life-Adjustment Education, which grew out of a series of Office of Education conferences, was that only 20 per cent of the students in American schools were capable of responding to a predominantly academic curriculum. That another 20 per cent were capable of responding to a predominantly vocational curriculum. And that the best thing that could be done with the other 60 per cent of future adults in this population was to give them neither an academic nor a vocational education but one that was predominantly avocational and behavioral—that centered around topics such as dating, dressing, eating, buying—and in short tried to adjust them, particularly to adjust them psychologically, to contemporary life. At least the Office of Education has moved beyond that appalling view of educational purpose. It now takes the position that vocational or Career Education is not only "takable" by 20 per cent, but is takable by 100 per cent, not only takable by 100 per cent but that it must be made compulsory for everybody. I suppose that's progress of a sort.

There are also some purely practical problems, serious practical problems, I think, with Career Education. Let us leave aside for the moment what I think of as the central question, the question of whether the idea of Career Education is deficient in its philosophy and indiscriminate in its sweep, and look briefly at just a couple of the very practical problems involved. One concerns the question of "the dignity of work," as it is most commonly called. A major objective of the Career Education movement is to change the attitude of Americans toward ordinary jobs and common work. The objective is to persuade everyone that all jobs are equal in God's eyes and ought to be in theirs. My response to this proposition is strongly conditioned by what I suppose is sheer prejudice. My political antennae begin to vibrate whenever I encounter ambitious schemes of government for changing—that is to say, controlling—people's opinions and attitudes and views. Although it may be an irrational fear on my part in this case, I nevertheless prefer to leave to authoritarian governments attempts to control not merely the actions of people but their thoughts

and attitudes as well. Fortunately, free governments have had a fairly poor record in trying to control attitudes and thoughts. I think they will probably have no more success in this instance.

I might mention also, in passing, that it seems to me only marginally true that we do not have a proper regard for work. Most Americans have an adequate regard for most kinds of honest work. I don't think that there is any stigma, for example, attached to the job of data processor or dental technician or assistant manager of a supermarket, or any of a thousand other jobs; and there is many a white collar worker in this country who looks with downright envy on the construction trades, or on the salaries of members of the Teamsters Union. Now of course there are jobs, menial jobs, that are held in pretty low esteem by the American public or any other public in any other industrialized nation of the world, but I simply don't think that the government has any chance of changing this by decree. If the title of "garbage collector" is suddenly changed to "operative of the sanitation department," I don't think anybody is fooled by that, and I don't think schools can do very much about this problem, however desirable it might be to do something about it, through exhortation or declamation. I don't think the schools have any business trying to change the relative status of jobs in the eyes of the general public. That is one practical problem with Career Education.

The second practical problem has to do with manpower predictions. If Career Education is to mean anything, it presumably means that individuals are not only to be prepared for specific types or clusters of jobs, but are to be given reliable advice about what the supply and demand situation is going to be for those jobs a number of years down the road. The problem, as the Department of Labor, other major departments of government and many private organizations have learned, is that modern technology, the speed of industrial change, and the vagaries of public policy and politics, do not permit very reliable manpower predictions in many fields. Dr. Marland just cited one tonight—one out of four chemists out of work. And there are a lot of engineers and scientists, highly trained, now looking for a job who are quite bitter about the rosy manpower projections in those fields that were made in the 1950s and 1960s when they were in graduate school.

Now it seems to me just as possible that the data processing industry, to take a field that is very popular for vocational training right now, may be just as crowded in the near future as engineering

is now. I can't help wondering if the student trained in the schools as a data processor in 1972, and finding himself unemployed in 1982, is going to look back in anger or in gratitude at Career Education.

There is a third practical problem, a very important and perhaps decisive one. I can't take time to discuss it in any detail now. Maybe we can get at it during the general discussion. It is this: I have the greatest difficulty imagining just how it is that Career Education is going to be taught in the classroom, and what is to be the substance of the curriculum. No one has revealed, for instance, how teachers, who are widely believed to be inadequately trained in the subjects they teach now, are going to be adequately trained in a whole host of new subjects having to do with the labor market (they themselves are almost as far removed from the labor market as their students are). No one has revealed how people who are called guidance counselors in the schools, who are widely believed to do a quite inadequate job now of guiding their students either to college or jobs, are going to avoid compounding their failures by having thrust on them a vast new responsibility for helping to relate all of their students to the world of work.

And no one has revealed the pedagogical techniques, and they're certainly going to have to be very cogent ones, by which teachers, even if they are competent in Career Education, are going to be able to connect the academic subject, or any other subject at hand, with jobs in any but the most superficial fashion. The Office of Education, I must say, is not much help on this absolutely critical point. The literature from the Office that I have seen scarcely makes mention of it. In passing they say, for instance, that a science teacher will relate a science lesson perhaps to the job of x-ray technician, or maybe of oceanographer. They say that social studies teachers will talk about jobs for geographers and artists and printers, and other such trades and vocations. Period, that's all they say. Now just extend that advice to an actual classroom situation and ask yourself what the teacher can possibly do, with 25 students, in, say, a 9th grade class in general science. The Office doesn't say how many students, or at what level of the educational system, are going to be *told* about jobs, just told, with the jobs described in some way, how they're to be described, how much time it will take, how many students at what point in the system are going to be *shown* these jobs in some realistic situation, how many are actually going to be *trained* and under what circumstances, how much time all of this is going to take, and what in the

present curriculum is going to have to give way to make room for it.

That is the third practical problem, and as I say, I hope we can can come back to it. The fourth and final purely practical question I would raise has to do with cost. I raise the question almost as an indecent aside, since many people seem to react to the whole idea of worrying about cost as an antediluvian concern. Nobody seems to know, at this point, how expensive Career Education might be, how much it is going to cost to create all the materials, to train all of the people, to establish all the programs, and to do all of the other things that have to be done. What is certain is that it will all be an add-on cost to the present budget, and that it won't be small. Now it seems to me on this ground alone, leaving all other issues aside, that the burden of proof is entirely on the shoulders of those who advocate Career Education. The nation's investment in education in the last twenty years has gone up at a far faster rate than the Gross National Product has. This year we will be spending somewhere between 80 and 90 billion dollars on formal instructional programs of some kind, 80 to 90, depending on how you tote it up. So that if the public is now to be asked, or compelled, to spend a lot more on something called Career Education, I believe that the case for doing so has to be made in far more concrete and persuasive terms than has yet been done.

Well, having said all that in criticism of Career Education, is there something to be said on the other side, is there something to be said for it? I think there is some common ground upon which the advocates of Career Education and the advocates of basic education can stand and, I would hope, shake hands. We might begin with an acknowledgment of an obvious fact: lack of interest, lack of motivation on the part of students, is a pervasive phenomenon everywhere in the world. It is true of all students to some extent, and of some students to a large extent. We might also agree that all industrialized countries of the world and quite a few developing countries of the world share the following problem: They take all people in that society at age 6, 7 in some places, to age 15 in some countries, 16 in others, 17, 18, with us—we might even say 21, or more—they take that population whose natural bent is for action and they bottle it up for substantial periods of time in institutions called schools, where it is subjected to a certain amount of physical restraint and, one hopes, intellectual discipline.

Students react to this part-time incarceration in various ways. As we all know, most students seem to cope with it without discernible damage, some students resist it but stay the course to the end and graduate without any particular accomplishments or prospects, and some fight it every step of the way and drop out as soon as possible. Everywhere in the world educators struggle with the problem of the last two groups in particular, the resisters and the dropouts. In our present state of knowledge, nobody, in any country that I know of, has had very much success in designing programs for these groups of students. Most of these students, as Dr. Marland has said, wind up in something called the general track, or the general program, of the secondary school, which is a meaningless mélange, a monument to Life-Adjustment Education. Out of the general program come students ill-prepared for much of anything—for further education, for a job, or, I daresay, for life.

The advocates of basic education strongly feel that these two groups of students, the resisters and the dropouts, have a special need for the education that is most truly vocational. And that is an education grounded in language, number, and other so-called academic subjects. Set aside for a moment the question of whether that kind of education contributes to an individual's learning how to live, which I think is the ultimate purpose, and look at only a few of the very mundane considerations. It seems to me that most employers' complaints about new employees, high school graduates, come about not because these graduates lack specific job skills, but because they lack elementary literacy. If one looks at the first year's work of most postsecondary vocational and technical institutions—whether proprietary, private, public, or whatever—much of that first year's work is remedial, in basic academic subjects, particularly English and mathematics. Or if one looks, for example, at that enormous apparatus in New York City known as City University, and at the amount of time and energy and money consumed within that institution on the problems created by open admissions, one will again recognize that most of those resources go to meet the costs of remedial basic academic work, especially in English and mathematics. And if you look at any of the manpower programs of the 1960s or the current ones, the Job Corps for example, and many of the others, you find exactly the same pattern. Even though the age group may be a little older, much of the first year's work is remedial, again in the basic academic subjects of English and mathematics. Well, one could go on citing, I think,

a lot of examples to indicate that the quintessential need of these two groups of students—far more so than with the rest, for whom there are many other chances—the quintessential need of the resisters and the dropouts is for some kind of minimum mastery of their own language, some minimum competence in number, and some acquaintance with other basic subjects.

The advocates of basic education also recognize, I hope, that no nation on earth has yet discovered how to give an exclusively academic education, in a system of universal schooling, to everybody through age 17 and 18. Until teachers can be found who can turn the ideal into the real, until the other conditions can be created that will allow these students to achieve academic success, then I think people of CBE persuasion should settle, as indeed I think they do settle, for some kind of reasonable combination of academic and vocational education, particularly in the secondary school, particularly the last two years of the secondary school. Now the proportions of academic and vocational work would obviously vary—school to school, person to person, group to group—but in no place, under this scheme of things, I would hope, would the so-called general track, the general program of the school, survive. It ought to be scrapped everywhere for the abomination that it has always been.

If the advocates of Career Education would also settle for that kind of reasonable compromise, which I admit sounds a little like old-fashioned vo-ed, we then would have only the details to argue about. But I take it that an approach of such modesty is not acceptable. The more vocal and enthusiastic advocates of Career Education have seen the future and it works, though they do not tell us exactly where they have seen it. They are sure it works, for everybody. It seems to me that unless the more militant spokesmen, if I can call them that, for Career Education accept a scheme of less grandeur, or the advocates of basic education are ready to throw in the towel, the two groups are going to have to continue in fundamental disagreement. That disagreement is based on the philosophy of education implicit in Career Education, a philosophy that is too narrow and constricting, on a system or proposal that is too indiscriminate in its sweep, and that is confronted with all of the practical problems of manpower projection, forced choice of occupation too early for many students, the questions of pedagogical technique that have yet to be resolved, the question of cost, and the other issues that I have tried to cover.

Dr. Dolce: As I listened closely to our two speakers and their apparent differences of viewpoint, I sensed also some areas of agreement. I heard an agreement on the criticism of the inadequacies of the general curriculum and a recognition of the problems which are caused by prolonged adolescence and schools. And an admission that our schools are not functioning well enough for all the students in those schools. I also know, Sid, that you have stated very openly your opposition to forced choice of vocations in the schools and I do not think that that is your intent at all. Would you mind elaborating on this? As I have read your remarks I have judged that you are concerned about the need for information about various career alternatives that would be available to all students, and the requirements of various occupations.

Dr. Marland: The point is to inform young people about life's opportunities for work and to help them to make choices at whatever point they want to spin off from the system, and to equip them for that, whether it is early on or late on or even at middle age or later. This is the theory that we are attempting to hammer out, and I quickly agree with Dr. Koerner that it's far from firm. This is something we've been discussing in more or less systematic ways for less than a year and a half, and one doesn't evolve a major theme in anything, certainly education, in 18 months. So it is far from a concept that has formality or definition, and I am glad of it. Because if it were defined at this stage it would obviously be a totally innocuous thing. We are talking about ways in which the youngster grows, and we are saying that the school should help equip him to judge his options and to equip himself with some control on his own part and his family's part, and not leave it all to chance.

George Weber (Associate Director, Council for Basic Education): I would like to talk about one of the points that Dr. Koerner raised, in two ways. It does seem to me on the basis of what I have read, and some of your remarks tonight, Dr. Marland, that there's an egalitarian notion that even though people don't regard all occupations as equal, we are going to make them do it. And this is part of the whole new approach. Similarly, it seems to me, a related question is the whole notion of a meaningful career. In something you wrote for *Science* last spring you referred to the source of satisfaction that scientific careers give to many people in science, and you said that many young people don't gain the sense of dignity and achievement of a meaningful career. And you blamed this on the education system. But doesn't

blame rest mostly with the economic system? I don't mean blame in the sense we can do anything about it, but isn't it inherent that some jobs, if done year after year, are dull? If you are going to pump gas year after year, or you are going to wash dishes year after year, you would really be indulging in some sort of distortion of the normal meaning of words to call either of these occupations a meaningful career. Now is Career Education going to aim at abolishing these jobs, which seems to me not really education's province, or is it going to help make people be happier with them? It seems to me these two matters are related.

Dr. Marland: I am not sure that I arrived at all the assumptions that you are arriving at for me. But I would say that one of the goals of Career Education is to make it clear that there are many ways to reach excellence. Our society over the past twenty or thirty or forty years, under a driving compulsion which has goaded all of us to some extent, has been saying that college is one of the marks of excellence—probably *the* mark of excellence at a certain stage in a person's growth—and that not to have gone to college is somehow bad, evil, not worthy in our value system. I'll go this far with you in what you've been implying as to conclusions drawn from the Career Education idea: Some young people, many young people perhaps, go to college simply because it is the thing to do. I think it is a curse upon our system, and a wasteful exercise for our colleges and universities and our treasury, to have young people going to college simply because it is the thing to do, without knowing particularly why they are there. I am afraid a great many are there because our values, our *mores*, have pushed them that way.

Now I think it is a great credit to us that we in the United States can say that 64 per cent of our high school graduates at least enter higher education. As I meet in international sessions with ministers of education from throughout the world, they don't believe that. When they ask for an exchange of data, the Minister of Education of Italy, for example, says his country has reached 11 per cent and that this is great. Then they ask, "Marland, what's yours?" I say 64 per cent, and they say something like "You're crazy, you know. You can't do that." Well, maybe we shouldn't.

In and of itself, to go to college is neither right nor wrong. I am asking for something that speaks to a broader definition of rightness and wrongness, something that says that a good number of young people find ways to reach fruition as human beings other than going

to college. To that extent, I agree with what Dr. Koerner says. I also say that, as we attempt to enhance ways of life other than those which call for a college degree, this, too, is an honest expression of what we are talking about in Career Education. There is importance in dignity for those who choose to work with their hands or with their hands and their minds, not necessarily with a college degree.

You remember that our good friend, George Counts, back in Columbia in the '30s, asked: "Dare we, dare we attempt to change society through education?" I would say no, not really, but I think that pragmatically we have to help young people grow, with options open, and not say that in order to gain salvation you have to go this or that way. Guidance counselors get their Brownie points by the number of students they get into college, especially the exclusive colleges, not by the numbers of students who find fulfillment as human beings doing something they want to do. That's part of our system. I am asking that we bring balance and rationality to that system so that a person does not have only the college option as his way to salvation.

As for saying that we're going to make gas pumping beautiful, I don't say that, but I do say that if we can help the 70 I.Q. youngster find ways to live a whole life and not be a burden on society, if we can help him pump gas in a way to fulfill his capacities as a human being, to do it responsibly, knowing how to make out a sales slip and to write the numbers on it and add them up, that's a worthy purpose.

Dr. Koerner: Nobody disputes that, Dr. Marland. Are we talking about people with 70 I.Q.s?

Dr. Marland: When we are talking about a gas pumper, perhaps, because the schools serve *all* children in all their differing capacities. Mr. Weber asked whether we were going to make gas pumping an exalted thing. My answer is "worthy"—not exalted.

Dr. Koerner: Whenever anyone asks a general question about Career Education the answer comes in terms of the specific example, and it usually describes a student who has an academic problem. Now is that the population that is really involved? All of the literature that I've read says that *everybody* is going to be taking Career Education, all the way through his education, no matter what, from kindergarten through the graduate school.

Dr. Marland: You don't *take* Career Education in my book.

Dr. Koerner: Well then, they will be continuously exposed to it, whatever it is.

Dr. Marland: We should provide the means to help learners find fulfillment in our society, intellectually as well as in a utilitarian sense, yes.

Clifton Fadiman (Council for Basic Education Board): It doesn't seem to me that advocates of any particular philosophy, whether it be basic education or Career Education, will get anywhere until they face certain facts that our leaders do not admit. One fact has become evident only in the last twenty years consequent upon the advance of technology. That fact is that there is no dignity whatsoever in work. I myself am a perfect product of Career Education. I've had 62 jobs, beginning as an errand boy. I learned nothing from any of them, except what you learn from training—which, of course, has nothing to do with education. There is no intellectual discipline whatsoever involved in the proper making out of a sales check. There is no dignity whatsoever in being a garbage collector. Garbage collecting is not part of the health sciences, it is garbage collecting. Until we tell our citizenry that the antique work ethic *which made this country*—that's perfectly true—but which has been outmoded and now indeed is becoming outlawed by the progress of technology, until Mr. Nixon ceases to talk in terms of 19th century Manchester work ethics, we are going to fool our young citizens. Until we tell them that it is hopeless to look for fulfillment in most of the jobs that are available to them, we will be fooling them.

My advocacy of basic education is based on the notion that it is a consolatory activity, that it helps the gas pumper to live during the time that he is not pumping gas. I believe that technology is going to create a new feudal system; it is already beginning to create it. And I believe, also, that the unconscious drive of some advocates of Career Education (not true of you, Commissioner), another word for job training, is to condition the technological serf who will be with us during the next two or three hundred years by the hundreds of millions, to fool him, to adjust him so that he will not realize that his life is unfulfilled, unexamined, tedious. Back of your efforts and those of your colleagues may be a generous attempt to help Americans be less unhappy than they are. But my objection to the movement is that it is running counter to very deep undercurrents in American culture today. One of them is the questioning of the work ethic, not on sentimental grounds, but on economic grounds. Technology is

beginning to outmode the work ethic. Another undercurrent relates to the notion that somehow relevance is attached to earning a living. Youngsters are beginning to disbelieve that. I've been in many schools lately and talked to a lot of kids, and when they complain of irrelevance it is not high-falutin' philosophizing in the stratosphere. When they ask for relevance, they are not asking for the curriculum to be related to possible jobs at all. They are asking for relevance on the deepest possible level, the same thing that Plato was talking about, even if they use a fuzzy vocabulary to describe their feelings. I fear that the program of vocational education, no matter how noble its motivation, is not going to answer their demand. It won't make them feel that what they get in the school is more relevant. It will make them feel it is less relevant. Another thing is this: youngsters, even those who want to work (and most youngsters do want to work), no longer, in many cases, think of their lives as you and I and many round this table have done, that is, in terms of *a* career. Many of them think in terms of ten careers or mere experience, the sort of thing that Goethe was talking about. You and I, Dr. Marland, were brought up to get somewhere. Perhaps you were brought up in somewhat humble circumstances.

Dr. Marland: In the early Depression years. . . .

Mr. Fadiman: Exactly. So was I and so we think in terms of a career. But many youngsters today do not do so. They think of life in very different terms. Though they can't phrase it exactly, they want a lot of different experiences, and those experiences are not necessarily connected with rising on the ladder until you become President.

Dr. Marland: I am not at all in disagreement with the things you have been saying. We have brought young people from a wide variety of circumstances, economic, social, ethnic, into our deliberations on this subject, and—without boring you with a lot of statistics and data—we have a truly remarkable sense of support for our notions as we describe them. Now this is not simply to sweep aside your observation about whether young people really want to work. It is to say that we are able to communicate what Career Education might be, that we are getting just unbelievable endorsement from young people from a broad social and economic cross section.

Mr. Fadiman: You can get endorsement for anything.

Dr. Marland: But let me continue, because I have only just begun to treat one of your observations. That is your assumption—and it

can easily be assumed from my exposition—that we were talking about economic ends as part of the work idea. I am among the first to concede that economic ends are not necessarily today, with young people, the ultimate goal that you and I might have found in our life in a different generation. I do think, however, that work, as more broadly defined and not necessarily pertaining to economic ends, is something that young people do want, as you observed. Most young people want to find work, something useful. Now the word *useful* is to me more germane to our discussion than the word *relevant*. Many young people are walking to a different drumbeat, but if you really listen closely to what they're saying—and I think you'll agree, Mr. Fadiman—when they say *work* they may be talking about something that serves society and isn't necessarily economically important to them. Is that a fair translation of your observation?

Mr. Fadiman: That's very true.

Dr. Marland: I buy this. I buy it most warmly. I have it in my family, with a 24-year-old daughter. She has no motivation whatever toward economic ends but is very much concerned with being useful. She spent two years in Africa as a volunteer serving the evacuees from Sudan, trying to help them find a way of life because she believes deeply in working, knows something about working, and has equipped herself for working as a teacher. To her, the economic gain is meaningless. The social value in what she is doing has taken the place of what you and I might have had driving us 30 or 40 years ago.

Many young people are driven by serving mankind in ways that are larger, finer, more beautiful, more noble, closer to the ancient ethics of civilization than what we have come to in our *mores* in measuring by dollars. But I have to come back and ask: What is usefulness, and where does Career Education come into this? It comes into this by saying that the young person with Career Education experience does have something useful he can do to serve mankind. It may be as a teacher of emotionally disturbed children, or as a person who knows how to build bridges or how to help improve the health of people. Those are things that many young people now find motivate them, but I have to say if you are going to improve the health of people or grow better poultry or build better bridges, find ways to serve mankind, you can't do it with a guitar, sitting on a curbstone in conversation. The utility, if you will, the bleak utilitarian ends of an intellectual commitment that combines basic education and something useful for society—that is what I am talking about.

Dr. Orville Sweeting (Council for Basic Education Board): There are a number of things that come to mind as we talk about this. I think we are going to see a terrifically important change in attitude toward What is education?, and What is basic education?, and What is Career Education? There are many forces that are going to change education, it seems to me, for much of the work that goes on now in the upper grades in the high schools of this country is pretty much a waste of time. And now that the student is expected to be mature and capable of taking part in society at the age of 18, it would seem to me that something is going to have to be done besides compulsorily holding that kid in school until he's 16 years of age, as we do now.

Dr. Marland: Agreed.

Dr. Sweeting: And I think that we are going to have to instill in him some kind of motivation for the basic intellectual activities by having him engaged in something that has to do with the real world at an earlier age than has ever occurred before. I am seeing it a little bit in the state where I come from, Connecticut. We are seeing a total revolution in teacher education, for instance. I think this is going to permeate its way gradually clear down into the schools. We are not going to teach Career Education as a separate entity in the schools at all, but at some stage or other, at about the 8th grade or even a little higher perhaps, there will be a multitude of alternatives to education. The compulsory twelve years of education is going to disappear. There will be a multitude of alternatives in education: call it work-study or whatever you like. But we will still have to try to show these kids as they are growing up that there is real work in studying English, and reading, and languages, and mathematics by the fact that they cannot move into certain areas that they might wish to move into unless they do the basic homework. I think, to answer Jim Koerner, that it is not going to be necessary to add the cost of Career Education on to everything that we are doing now. I think that much of what we are trying to teach now will have to be scrapped and replaced by something else. We've started in New Haven with some alternatives to education and the kids fall into this program not because they have I.Q.s of 75 (some of them have I.Q.s of 125) but because it's the first time they've ever been free to do what they want to do.

Dr. Marland: Control over their own destiny is what I'm talking about.

Dr. Sweeting: This is the key to it, this is the key to it, I think. For the first time we are doing it at the junior high level.

Mr. Fadiman: But you are teaching them to read and write first, Dr. Sweeting.

Dr. Sweeting: Some of them can't, at first, read and write before entering the alternative program (we call it High School in the Community). They are the kind of functional illiterates we are talking about, in about 50 per cent of the cases, but as soon as they feel what they are doing in the school classroom is going to have something to do with their destiny, they realize they have got to learn to read and write.

Dr. Marland: That's the *motivation* part of Career Education. There is a purpose now in their doing what the schools have expected them to do, what families and society have expected them to do all these years, which most of them have done all these years, except for about 18 per cent of our society who don't get that message and therefore don't learn. Those are the people that Dr. Sweeting is talking about.

Dr. Sweeting: As a result some of them come back into the formal classroom early in the morning and then go off to their career jobs. I don't think it's going to have to be added on but we are going to have to scrap a lot of what we do. The economic motivation, as much as you decry it and depreciate it, is, I think, a powerful motivation for about half our students at the present time. And for that half at least, a combination of opening up the windows to Career Education may stimulate, actually, the emphasis on basic reading, writing, mathematics, languages, that we are most interested in at the moment. I don't think you can decree it by saying you shall take these courses and if you are a good student in them then certain things will open up to you. That doesn't work any more. I am in higher education right now and the students seem to be turning against the liberal arts subjects. But not really, for they are trying to fulfill themselves now in some other way and I think this wheel will turn in two or three years. What they are going into, though, are the allied health programs and they soon find there that mathematics is indispensable, for instance, and that language and the ability to write and communicate are indispensable.

Mr. Fadiman: At what age do they find that out?

Dr. Sweeting: They are finding it out at the age of about 18 now.

Mr. Fadiman: That's kind of rough on them.

Dr. Sweeting: Yes, it is.

Dr. Marland: That is why we are trying to get Career Education into the system in the early grades—so that a youngster doesn't have to wait until he suddenly arouses himself to the realities of his deficiencies at age 18 or 20. We are attempting to establish Career Education as a way of thinking in addition to, as a supporting instrument for, formal learning in the elementary schools.

Dr. Sweeting: The other thing that I want to mention is that the vo-ed act of 1917, the Smith-Hughes Act, mentioned by the Commissioner, has been one of the worst thorns in our educational system because of the narrowness of it. Now, for the first time in fifty years, it has been possible to broaden this horizon and use Federal funding for a wide variety of activities. I had my eyes opened to this about ten years ago when I visited some schools in the Greenwich area and Darien where about 75 to 90 per cent of the kids go off to college and one might have thought that the vo-ed areas of the schools would be extremely small. It turned out that they had better machine shops, better woodworking shops than we did in New Haven where only about 50 per cent of our kids continue any form of education. What was the reason? The principal and the superintendent told us: This is the last time that these kids will have a chance to get their hands dirty, perhaps, and learn how to operate machinery, and be able to do some things which, for their own fulfillment, will be just as important to them as Latin, mathematics, and languages that they would expect to spend most of their lives in. Now, very crudely put, I'm thoroughly in favor of the notion of Career Education as long as it isn't something which is imposed along with imposition of other subjects. I think that what we're going to have to do is sweep the whole thing clear, perhaps, and start out with a number of mini-courses. Education then becomes really a lifelong experience.

Mrs. Talcott Bates (Council for Basic Education Board): I am very much concerned about who is going to give these students an opportunity to work when they can't spell *cat*. Who is going to give them the chance to get motivated?

Dr. Marland: When they can't spell *cat*?

Mrs. Bates: You say you will find that they will get their motivation in the actual working process. How are they going to get this?

Dr. Marland: We have many unanswered questions, but at the heart of the answer is motivation.

Mrs. Bates: We have labor, in certain fields at least, sewed up by the unions; there is no opportunity for young people to get a hands-on experience there. You are even talking about putting career studies into the junior high schools which has been, perhaps, our best chance for a hands-on experience, but now there is talk about taking that out of the junior high schools and putting it in the high schools, so you are pushing further on, even, the hands-on experience.

Dr. Dolce: Are you describing what's happening in California now?

Mrs. Bates: Yes.

Dr. Marland: The hands-on experience with work, you mean.

Mrs. Bates: Yes, or actual training in vocational areas.

Dr. Marland: I would hope that all young people, starting at about the middle school or junior high school, would begin to have some kind of exposure to hands-on experience with work and that this would continue through high school. It would not be the traditional industrial arts course, where they make bird houses in woodshop, but a variety of exposures to work in a much more sophisticated sense.

Mrs. Bates: I am very much afraid this whole aspect of Career Education must go beyond occupational exposures. The minute you emphasize this, it seems to me, you get into the generalizations that most people who are involved in education are familiar with. They can handle big concepts. But when it comes down to the actual skill training, most teachers are verbally inclined, and they are not familiar with hands-on approaches, and I don't know where it is going to come from.

Dr. Marland: I think it will come from our business and industrial community. There is an overwhelming readiness, responsiveness, in the industrial community to share in this notion.

Mr. Fadiman: Have they offered them jobs in addition to the training?

Dr. Marland: Yes. That record is clear.

Mr. Fadiman: Are they offering them jobs in 1990?

Dr. Marland: I'm not so sure about 1990.

Mr. Fadiman: But that's the date I'm interested in.

Dr. Marland: It's very important to me too, and I *am* sure that today's elementary-age children must be ready to adapt to whatever is "work" in 1990.

Dr. Sweeting: I'm interested in 1974.

Dr. Marland: Dr. Koerner's observations about our manpower predictions are very sound. This is an art that is so immature as to be almost completely unreliable, and the first people to acknowledge it are the experts in the field. That's why Career Education doesn't attempt to describe itself as aiming toward a finite job for a young person as a bricklayer or a computer programmer.

Mr. Fadiman: But talks about clusters?

Dr. Marland: Right, that's why we have the cluster idea.

Mr. Fadiman: Are we so sure of the persistence of clusters?

Dr. Marland: No, not even that, but we figure that at least we are dealing with a generalization that is more promising for the future than, say, bricklaying. In other words, a young person who chooses to go into what might be called broadly the construction cluster is ranging from laborer to artisan to architect or manager, and in this context he finds, presumably, over the years, a mobility and sufficient basic training and education to afford that mobility as technology changes.

To comment on another point you raised, Mr. Fadiman—I couldn't agree with you more that we are living in a time when technology may well dehumanize our way of life so much that the only humane things we do are those that we do outside the world of work.

Mr. Fadiman: It is a rather terrible admission, though.

Dr. Marland: Isn't it, isn't it, yes. I would have to say, however, that as we read about young men working in the automobile plants in Michigan and the grave social and psychological problems that they are facing. . . .

Mr. Fadiman: That's what I was thinking about.

Dr. Marland: I suspected you might be, and this is the fact that we have to face, that technology has dehumanized work. All right, then, those young people—and I have to say that this, too, is a part of education's obligation—having completed what may be a four-hour or five-hour day, or a thirty-hour week, must find ways to remain useful and mentally healthy human beings in ways other than the performance of work, which under the work ethic was in and of itself a sufficiently satisfying way to live.

Mr. Fadiman: You and I are nearer to each other than I thought.

Dr. Marland: Thank you, Mr. Fadiman.

Dr. Sweeting: I can add a little reinforcement to what Mrs. Bates asked. In our community of New Haven the businesses in the whole

community are already training about 600 of our kids who go out of school and work.

Dr. Marland: I happen to be quite familiar with New Haven schools. There's probably no more shining example, to answer your question as to whether industry will respond, than there is right at this moment in the city of New Haven. The Olin Corporation, the Bell Telephone Company, other business people are engaged chin-deep in the schools of that city, working with the young people, giving of their resources, and not solely in eleemosynary ways but in ways to make that city a better city and to make their corporations better corporations. Olin Corporation was doing this at least five years ago in the New Haven schools, and Bell Telephone is doing it now throughout the United States. They are coming into education responsibly, to help the schools face the realities of what the real world is like, and these kinds of things give me courage, Mr. Fadiman, to say that all signs indicate that industry will be there to help. I have met very recently with the leaders of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. They want to know what they can do to make the Career Education movement fly. I can't tell them; it is not that secure yet. Career Education has to grow town by town, state by state, if it's going to grow, or else it should die. It certainly will not be prescribed by Washington, as Dr. Koerner implied, because that is the best way to kill it. But the New Haven example must be replicated across the land, by local initiative and local partnerships.

Dr. Koerner: Well, Federal prescription is certainly implied in Office of Education documents, Dr. Marland.

Dr. Marland: It is offered as a way to encourage people to make their choices within very broad criteria. There are no specifications. We have avoided, as you suggested, any definitions. You call that cloudy. It is deliberate. It is to say that if this is of any worth, it is not going to be defined in Washington.

Mr. Fadiman: But the dough is going in one direction and not in another.

Dr. Marland: It may well be, and this may well be creative variation. Connecticut will be doing it one way, and Houston is going in some ways quite different from those of New Haven, but they're equally beneficial. They are the property of the faculties, the communities, the industries, the Boards of Education in those environments, but they both meet such broad criteria as, for example, that we eliminate the general curriculum—a criterion that I hold essential

—and that young people have experience and knowledge about the world of work, and that sex biases be removed from occupational options. How they meet those criteria can be quite different, and this is what we are saying.

Mrs. Barry Bingham (Council for Basic Education Board): Dr. Marland, I don't see why, since industry is so cooperative, you can't just revert to what I believe New York State had earlier on, a very thriving work-study, work-release program. What I must say I dread, from what I gather is your plan, is the imposition of another great bureaucracy. I sat on a panel a few years ago, an advisory panel to HEW after the great vocational education act was passed, and I emerged from that experience with the feeling that once you get caught up in a bureaucracy like the vocational education bureaucracy the inertia is such that you never get away from it, you can never change anything. Now at that time the CED was saying that two million families should leave the farms every year because small farming was becoming obsolete. And at that very moment my colleagues, my vocational-agriculture colleagues on the panel, were pressing, and I must say with complete success, for immense doubling and redoubling of the appropriations for vocational agriculture in the high schools which I kept saying was, after all, a disservice to young people, since they were being led to believe that this course would lead to gainful employment on the farms. Indeed it would not. And you saw this all through the sessions we held: for instance, the people in what they called distributive education wanted ever so much more money, in order to put, you know, store counters in all the high schools, regardless of whether the children were mostly going to college or not, so they could be taught how to make out sales slips and sell ribbons. I must say I dread to see the extension of this point of view and of this approach which I think would threaten the general education curriculum, if, as you say (and reports from the Office of Education seem to me to say), vocational education is to be introduced from the cradle to the grave.

Dr. Marland: I have completely failed to communicate if we are mixing up vocational education with Career Education.

Mrs. Bingham: Well, I must say I am very unclear about the difference.

Dr. Marland: I have said all I could say to try to describe the difference. Vocational education is indeed a part of Career Education, just as English and mathematics and music are, but it is far from

being the same thing. Vocational education is a useful subsystem within Career Education for those traditional components that have to do with, let's say, agriculture or distributive education. But I would have to say that Career Education also pertains to medicine and the performing arts and architecture—and philosophy.

Mrs. Bingham: But I can't see how you can possibly foresee the jobs that are going to be available within the lifetime of these young people. And I would say that a much more sensible approach to preparing them for a satisfactory life would be to develop in them the kind of flexible and poised state of mind that you get from what you say you are going to do away with—a good general education.

Dr. Marland: Holy mackerel! I have failed completely if you think I am saying we would do away with general education. Dr. Koerner and I agree on eliminating the general *curriculum*. That is quite different from general *education*.

Mrs. Bingham: I quote you right here.

Dr. Marland: You will find that I have been quoted as wanting to eliminate "general education" in some documents, but nothing could be further from the truth. I am talking about the general *curriculum* as it is offered in high schools, which is a nothing. I am not talking about general *education*, regardless of how I may have been misquoted.

Mrs. Bingham: Well, you have been misquoted right here because you say that true and complete reform of the high school cannot be achieved until general education is completely done away with.

Dr. Marland: General *curriculum*, you see, and there is a great difference. General *education* for many people means what Conant meant in the Harvard report on general education in a free society 20 years ago. This to many people is the liberal arts, which I couldn't champion more. The general *curriculum* is that which is offered some people in big city high schools, about 60 or 70 per cent of the students—in more favored environments, 30 to 40 per cent—and this I hold is a nothing. But we have to watch out for those terms. They are tricky.

Mrs. Bingham: I am sorry, but it does come from your own office.

Dr. Marland: Forgive me if I get jumpy on this, but words have semantic subtleties that mean quite different things to different people. Some people will call general education that which results from the nonentity that is the general curriculum. I want to make clear that

what I am talking about is the general *curriculum*, which I would do away with.

But let me return to the vocational program. That program sometimes excludes the liberal arts. By and large it does not take account of what you would call basic education or formal learning. I am asking that—not only in elementary and secondary schools, but in colleges and universities—these be brought together in a rational composition saying that, indeed, art, music, literature, history are as important to the whole life as is becoming a computer analyst or a lawyer. They are not incompatible. If a person is going to be a lawyer, dealing for the rest of his life with the human condition, I think it quite important that he know and love poetry and philosophy and music.

Dr. Jacques Barzun (Council for Basic Education Board): Let's concentrate on the career side of things. What is actually done in the school about the career? Are students told about it or are they taught it? Apparently they are not taught it because they go and get it on the apprentice system. What then goes on as regards careers? Let's take liberal arts for granted. What enters, from the moment that your scheme begins to succeed, what enters the curriculum that we haven't had before? It isn't vocational, it isn't occupational, it is all by the apprentice system. What is new?

Dr. Marland: Well I would hope, Dr. Barzun, that there would be something new in making learning more joyful, more disciplined, better motivated for young people from about age ten through college.

Dr. Barzun: But by what means? We're all in favor of virtue.

Dr. Marland: All right. I will try to finish, sir. By making it more meaningful and saying that mathematics has usefulness, that science and history and English have usefulness. Up until this time we have assumed that learning is of itself its own reward. Teachers have taught that way. You are supposed to learn mathematics because it's good for you. I am holding that this hasn't worked for a great number of our youth and that therefore we will bring young people some aspiration about what they want to do with their life and say that mathematics relates to this kind of life style. We have a variety of offerings linked to our career clusters—in science, in history, certainly in biography, certainly in English composition—that will be germane to the world that a youngster at, say, age 14 is looking toward. The mathematics he does, the great lives he reads about, the science he learns, will have some kind of articulation with goals that have

meaning for him. At age 14 he may think he wants to be a doctor. He may decide two years later he is not interested at all in medicine. He may want to be an engineer. All right, he has the option to move, in terms of his own goals, not the school's goals, not society's goals.

Dr. Koerner: Dr. Marland, can we, as the jargon goes these days, can we just play this scenario out to one more specific step. Let's just hypothesize for a moment, and let's put together a class and see what a teacher can possibly do. Now let's take the age 14, take a 9th grade class, take a general science class in the 9th grade. Say the teacher has 25 students, and, according to the Office of Education's suggestion (I say it is a little more than that, that it is a recommendation), the students at that age either have already chosen or are in the process of choosing an initial occupation, cluster, what have you. Well, there are 25 students in your general science course. Suppose that only six of them, which seems quite plausible to me, have opted for any kind of science-related occupation. Six out of 25 in the 9th grade in a general science class. And suppose the teacher is teaching, say, a unit on the digital computer, very important in modern technology and for a general science class in view of the impact of the computer on modern life. What does a teacher do? Does he say to himself, well, only six of my 25 students have any interest at all, at least at this point, in a science-related career, therefore I can't take a lot of time talking about a lot of science-related careers. So I am going to ignore that in the interests of the 19. Or does he say to himself, it is perfectly obvious that none of the 25 have the slightest idea what kind of job he might be interested in after high school, therefore I'm going to cover a lot of science-related careers, and mention how the computer affects a lot of jobs in industry?

And then he asks himself, well, what jobs in the computer industry are going to be around in ten or fifteen years that would justify my encouraging students to take a possible interest in them? Then, having decided that, the teacher has to decide what it is about that group of industries or jobs that he is going to say. And having decided all that, he is confronted with the problem of how he is going to talk about the digital computer *itself* if he takes time to do all these other tasks. And he has no idea what group within that 25 he is addressing himself to. So in purely practical, pedagogical terms, how does Career Education work?

Dr. Marland: Well, I think you have brought us a brilliant illustration, and obviously you have said that teaching is going to have to

be much more sensitive, much more lively, much better equipped to respond to the needs of young people than it is now. The Lord knows it can be greatly improved.

But a more particular response to your question suggests that there would be some kind of rational grouping of young people in a science class, as distinct from a random gathering of 25. You would have some sort of grouping, pertaining to the perception of each child of his own career, in a given science class to begin with. Let's say that probably all young people in general science ought to have some exposure to the computer. I would probably make that as at least a subjective assumption today, just as we assumed some exposure to the typewriter and the telephone twenty-five years ago, as instruments for living. But this exposure would vary greatly according to what a youngster's momentary interests were. If he were going into engineering, if he were going into one of the social sciences that draws heavily upon computer applications, he would be in one group of 20 or 25 youngsters. If he were going into something quite removed from possible uses of the computer, he would be in some other group, and he would be taking English in another group too. This will certainly call for more artistic planning by our school administrators and certainly for much more skillful and responsive teaching by classroom teachers.

To give you another generalized answer to your question: We are now attempting, through contracts with The Ohio State University, to develop curriculums that do provide for general science, grade 9. We have been at work at this with Ohio State for about a year and a half, and there are at least three more years to go before I can give you very good answers to your questions. In addition to the work at Ohio State, all states are attempting to construct their own responses to your questions through curriculums that faculties are now building for various subjects, as related to Career Education.

Dr. Dolce: As is the case with all good conversation, we could go on late into the night, but we must draw to a close.

Dr. Marland: Just a final word on Career Education: It is an idea, a concept, a proposition aimed at doing a better job. We are hammering out the idea. At tables just like this, in rooms just like this, filled with thoughtful and concerned and able people competent to evaluate the notion, competent to add their support and enthusiasm, or to criticize or denounce, whatever it may be—this is where it is going to be hammered out. It may well be that it will be found unsound in

just such sessions as this and then be set aside. I have to say to Dr. Koerner that this is not a political, emotional, romantic commitment by the Office of Education. It is a sober idea, the best idea that I, as one school leader in the United States, have been able to come upon to focus our energies on making the schools work better for everybody. But it is not a command.

Dr. Dolce: Thank you very much.

COUNCIL FOR BASIC EDUCATION

OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS

President
CARL J. DOLCE
Dean, School of Education,
North Carolina State University

Vice President
MRS. TALCOTT BATES
Vice Chairman, California Health
Council, and former member,
State Board of Education

Treasurer
JOHN F. LATIMER
Executive Secretary, American
Classical League, and Professor
of Classics, The George
Washington University

JACQUES BARZUN
The University Professor,
Columbia University

ARTHUR BESTOR
Professor of History,
University of Washington

MRS. BARRY BINGHAM
Vice President of the Louisville
Courier-Journal and *Times*

CLIFTON FADIMAN
Author and critic

SERECK H. FOX
Professor Emeritus of
Industrial Pharmacy,
Wayne State University

THOMAS C. MENDENHALL
President,
Smith College

ORVILLE J. SWEETING
Professor of Chemistry,
Quinnipiac College

ERNEST H. VOLWILER
retired President and Consultant,
Abbott Laboratories

GLEN F. WEGNER
Superintendent of Schools,
Lompoc, California

STAFF

MORTIMER SMITH
Executive Director and
Bulletin Editor

GEORGE WEBER
Associate Director

PAUL KENNEDY
Business Manager

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

This is Number Twenty of a series of *Occasional Papers* published by the Council for Basic Education, 725 Fifteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20005. These *Papers* are distributed without charge to all members of CBE at time of initial publication. Except for Nos. 17, 18, 19 and 20, additional copies may be purchased at the rate of 25 cents for one, or 20 cents for quantities of twenty or more. Nos. 17, 18, 19 and 20 cost 50 cents each, 40 cents in quantity. Other titles still in stock are:

No. 2: "What Every Intelligent Woman Should Know About Education" by Sterling M. McMurrin.

No. 3: "The String Untuned: A Review of the Third Edition of Webster's New International Dictionary" by Dwight Macdonald.

No. 4: "Teacher Education: Who Holds the Power?" by Harold L. Clapp and James D. Koerner.

No. 8: "Five Views of the 'New Math'" by Edwin E. Moise, Alexander Calandra, Robert B. Davis, Morris Kline and Harold M. Bacon.

No. 10: "The Role of History in Today's Schools" by Erling M. Hunt, Charles G. Sellers, Harold E. Taussig and Arthur Bestor.

No. 11: "Raising Standards in the Inner-City Schools" by Daniel U. Levine.

No. 12: "The New English" by Sheridan Baker.

No. 14: "The Electronic Revolution in the Classroom: Promise or Threat?" by Fred M. Hechinger, John Henry Martin and Louis B. Wright.

No. 15: "What Are the Priorities for City Schools?" by Wilson C. Riles, Carl J. Dolce and Martin Mayer.

No. 16: "Merit Pay and Alternatives: Descriptions of Some Current Programs" by George Weber and William H. Marmion.

No. 17: "Phonics in Beginning Reading: A Guide for Teachers and Parents."

No. 18: "Inner-City Children Can Be Taught to Read: Four Successful Schools" by George Weber.

No. 19: "The New Case for Latin and the Classics" by John F. Latimer.